

for the District of Columbia, for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief on the ground that such provision or amendment violates the Constitution. For purposes of the expedited review, provided by this section the exclusive venue for such an action shall be the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(b) APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any order or judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia finally disposing of an action brought under subsection (a) shall be reviewable by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any such appeal shall be taken by a notice of appeal filed within 10 calendar days after such order or judgment is entered; and the jurisdictional statement shall be filed within 30 calendar days after such order or judgment is entered.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the District Court for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under subsection (a).

SA 168. Mr. HARKIN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 15 through 24 and insert the following:

TITLE IV—NONSEVERABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE
SEC. 401. NONSEVERABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), if any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

(b) NONSEVERABILITY OF PROHIBITION ON SOFT MONEY OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND INCREASED CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.—If any amendment made by section 101, or the application of the amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, each amendment made by sections 101 or 308 (relating to modification of contribution limits), and the application of each such amendment to any person or circumstance, shall be invalid.

SA 169. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. . RESTRICTION ON INCREASED CONTRIBUTION LIMITS BY TAKING INTO ACCOUNT CANDIDATE'S AVAILABLE FUNDS.

Section 315(k)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(i)(1)), as added by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CANDIDATE'S CAMPAIGN FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining the aggregate amount of expendi-

tures from personal funds under subparagraph (D)(ii), such amount shall include the net cash-on-hand advantage of the candidate.

(ii) NET CASH-ON-HAND ADVANTAGE.—For purposes of clause (i), the term "net cash-on-hand advantage" means the excess, if any, of

(I) the aggregate amount of 50% of the contributions received by a candidate during any election cycle (not including contributions from personal funds of the candidate) that may be expended in connection with the election, as determined on June 30 and Dec. 30 of the year preceding the year in which a general election is held, over

(II) the aggregate amount of 50% of the contributions received by an opposing candidate during any election cycle (not including contributions from personal funds of the candidate) that may be expended in connection with the election, as determined on June 30 and Dec. 30 of the year preceding the year in which a general election is held.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Stephen Bell of Senator DOMENICI's staff be accorded the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2001

Mr. KYL. Madam President, again, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 5 p.m. on Monday, April 2, 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. I further ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. there be 30 minutes for closing remarks on S. 27, to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. KYL. Madam President, again, on behalf of the leader, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will reconvene on Monday and resume the campaign reform bill for 30 minutes for closing remarks. Under the previous order, the Senate will conduct a roll-call vote on passage of S. 27, as amended, at 5:30 p.m. Following that vote, Senators should expect additional votes to occur immediately. Therefore, a late session can be expected with votes. Also, Members should expect votes to be limited to 20 minutes only; therefore, Members will have to be prompt for these votes and all votes during the week of the budget resolution.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KYL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators CONRAD, KENNEDY, and NICKLES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, thank you very much.

I say to my friend and colleague, we both have been here a long time. It is my intention to speak on campaign finance for probably 10 or 15 minutes. Does my colleague want to make a few remarks? His patience is wearing about as thin as mine.

Madam President, I will be happy to yield to my colleague a few minutes if that would accommodate his schedule.

If the Senator from North Dakota is seeking a few minutes, I am happy to accommodate his schedule.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I will be very brief.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair and the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I wanted to further engage the Senator from Arizona because the Senator from Arizona asserted that we have received the estimates of the cost of the President's tax package, and that is simply not the case. It is not true. If he has received it, I would like him to give me a copy because we haven't received it.

We haven't received it because the Joint Tax Committee has said they don't have sufficient detail about the President's package to do such a reestimate, and so we are being asked to go to a budget resolution without having the President's budget, without having the estimates from an independent source of the cost of the President's budget proposal, and with no markup in the Senate Budget Committee, which is unprecedented, not even an attempt to mark up in the Senate Budget Committee, and all under a reconciliation which denies Senators their fundamental rights to engage in extended debate and amendment.

There were remarks made on the floor that are just not true. It is one thing to have a disagreement, and we can disagree. We can even disagree on the facts. The facts are clear and direct. The differences between the present and 1993 are sharp. In 1993, we did not have the full President's budget. We did have sufficient detail for an independent, objective review of the cost of the President's tax proposals.